

# Fundamental Symmetries & Neutrinos Town Meeting

Organization for our community –  
do we need it?

# Introduction

- Our subfield has come a long way, and is now seen as a pillar of the field
- “New Standard Model” Initiative raised the visibility in the last LRP
- As illustrated by preceding talks, this sub field is not unified by being centered at a single major facility, but by the overarching science. So we are not as cohesive and focused as the other sub-fields.
- Diverse elements make it difficult for members of the community to be well educated about all aspects

## Do we need a venue to more effectively articulate needs and importance of this sub-field?

- We have no standing organization that agencies can reach out to for priorities and data
- We lack the ability to put forward “numbers” demonstrating the significance of sub-field (as for example large lab users groups have)
- We have no way to mobilize impacted community to speak (and to work our political contacts) when adverse budget situations occur.
- We might benefit from an ability to articulate the whole of the sub-field is greater than the sum of the parts – *advocacy*
- We lack a regular progression of PAC reports validating importance of our science
- Priority setting could be addressed

# What might this look like?

- Users Group (*a better title needed*)
  - Self organized – create draft mission statement, people sign up, elect a set of leaders, fine tune mission statement
  - Repository of knowledge/history
  - Have user group meetings
  - Prepare for LRPs etc/ respond to things like Tribble committee
  - Would *not* have traditional users group function to advise facility operators on needs of users
  - Can or should it be done without a “host” organization? Pros/cons...

# What might this look like?

- APS topical group?
  - Mechanism is defined by APS (200 people needed)
  - Value of APS sponsorship not clear – perhaps access to organizing sessions at APS meetings
  - Would provide an enduring structure and continuity
- Some kind of Hybrid
  - Is it possible to have something that both provides community voice, community education AND addresses setting priorities?
  - Self organized group reviewing themselves seems problematic
  - Perhaps articulating the need for some standing review mechanism to advise on priorities within the sub-field

# What are your thoughts?

- Is something needed?
- Thoughts on what it should look like?
- What functions would be most valuable to you?
- Do you want to help?
- What about addressing priorities?

## Send your comments to:

Brad Fillipone [bradf@caltech.edu]

David Hertzog [hertzog@uw.edu]

Takeyasu Ito [ito@lanl.gov]

Krishna Kumar [kkumar@physics.umass.edu]

Alan Poon [AWPoon@lbl.gov]

Michael Ramsey-Musolf [mjrm@physics.wisc.edu]

Susan Seestrom [seestrom@lanl.gov]

John Wilkerson [jfw@unc.edu]

## How one might go about beginning:

- Draft a mission statement like: *The XYZ group is formed to provide a forum to unify the FunSymm Community, to articulate the importance of the broad scientific goals of this field and the role and relationships of the various components. The XYZ group will maintain a repository of .....*
- Create a forum for individuals to sign up and nominate individuals to serve on an executive committee
- Vote on ex committee
- Ex committee draft detailed by-laws, refine mission for approval by membership approval, consider need for resources, begin discussion about ways prioritization could be addressed.
- ....see how this plays out in the community....assess next steps